

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application and the indication that claims 7, 8, and 10 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action, however, has tentatively rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by USPN 2,520,028 to M.S. Biskind (hereafter *Biskind*). The Office Action also rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over USPN 2,520,028 to Biskind in view of USPN 6,508,562 to Venkatram. The Office Action also rejected claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Biskind*.

The rejection under §35 U.S.C. 102 (b)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 2,520,028 to Biskind. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection made by the Examiner for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A lighting apparatus for *a LCD-TV*, comprising:
 - a hollow module having an inner reflective surface and an opening;
 - a light source disposed in the hollow module;
 - a lens disposed in the opening, having an incident surface and a display surface, the incident surface faced inside the hollow module, the lens located on *the LCD-TV*;
 - wherein light rays emitted from the light source are reflected by the inner surface and transmitted into the incident surface then exit the lens through the display surface.

(Emphasis added.)

The Examiner admitted that claim 10 contained allowable subject matter. Therefore, the LDC-TV limitation of claim 10 has been incorporated into claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is now moot, and this claim should be allowed.

Insofar as pending claims 2-5, 7-9 and 11 depend from claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the cited art.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500